

Remarks/Arguments

The Examiner rejects claims 1-17. Applicants cancel 1-6, 13, 15-17 in this response. Claim 18 is added. Claims 7-12 and 14 remain pending. Applicants request admittance of new claim 18.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) (Claims 1-4 and 7)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Omura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,138,477). In response, the applicants have canceled claims 1-4.

Regarding claim 7, the applicants have amended claim 7 to place it into independent form and respectfully asserts that the '477 patent does not teach "a plurality of coaxial support elements comprising a housing containing said plurality of redundant bearings". (Claim 7) The '477 teaches that "bearing support portions 6 are provided inside the cylinder 4 [which are] housed individually in the support portions 6." (Col 2, Lns 56-59) The support portions receive the rolling bodies, such as balls or rollers. (Col 2 Ln 56-59) The inside cylinder 4 contains the support portions. The reference does not teach a housing rotatably guiding the armature. (See Claim 7). By way of example, and not limitation, please see FIG. 2 of applicants' application for one embodiment of such a housing. The applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 based on the above points.

35 U.S.C. §102(a) (Claims 1-10 and 13-17)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-10 and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Fite et al. (U.S. 2003/0123767 A1). As stated above, the applicants have canceled claims 1-6 and placed claim 7 into independent form.

Regarding claim 7, the applicants respectfully assert that Fite et al. do not teach a housing as a coaxial support element. The Examiner turns to FIG. 1 in support of the

rejections but does not address the applicants' coaxial support element in the form of a housing, as claimed by the applicants in claim 7. Additionally, the applicants respectfully assert that reference 150 of FIG. 1 in the Fite et al. publication does not teach "an armature rotatably guided by" at least the housing. By way of example of one embodiment, and not limitation, please see FIG. 2, of applicant's application for one embodiment of a housing that guides an armature. The applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 based on these points.

Claims 8, 9, and 10 ultimately depend from claim 7 and therefore contain each of its limitations. At least for the reasons stated above for claim 7, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-10.

Regarding claims 13 and 14, the applicants have amended claim 14 to place it into independent form, incorporating all the elements of now canceled claim 13. The applicants agree with the Examiner's statement that Fite et al. does not disclose a rotor comprising a magnet (Office Action at page 4) and note that the Examiner does not assert that Fite et al. teach "a magnet connected to said fan blade." (Claim 14) A magnet coupled to a rotating fan blade would be a rotor in a motor. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 102(a) rejection of amended claim 14.

New claim 18 is introduced in this Office Action response and its admittance is requested.

The applicants have canceled claims 15-17 in this response.

35 U.S.C. §103 (Claims 11, 12)

The Examiner rejects claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fite et al. U.S. 2003/0123767 A1 in view of Umeda et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,982,064). Claim 11 ultimately depends on amended claim 7

Application No. 10/687,388
Amdt. Dated June 24, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 25, 2005
Docket No. 10006881-1

through claims 10, 9, and 8 (in order of dependence). For at least the reasons stated above for claim 7, the applicants respectfully assert that the Fite et al. reference does not anticipate claim 7 and so requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11.


Similarly, claim 12 depends ultimately from amended claim 7 through claims 11, 10, 9 and 8 and so contains each of claim 7's limitations. At least for the reasons stated above for claim 7, the applicants respectfully assert that the Fite et al. reference does not anticipate claim 7 and so requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12.

New claim 18 is introduced in this Office Action response and its admittance is requested.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 24, 2005

By: 
James J. Dawson
Registration No. 41,701
Attorney for Applicants

Hewlett-Packard Company
P.O. Box 272400
Intellectual Property Administration
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
E/J/H/HP06881US2/HP06881US2.Amend

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service, Express Mail Label EV460258226US, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

6-24-05
Date


Eleanor Nakada